20th January 1930]

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—"May I know what is the test they would apply to this and whether they would treat it as a productive scheme or a protective one?" 11-15 a.m.

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—"That question will be considered when we receive the report and consider the financial aspect."

Prevention of the submersion of lands in Chintamani, Trichinopoly taluk.

* 1045 Q.—Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state what are the various proposals that were considered or are still under the consideration of the Government to prevent submersion of lands in Chintamani, Trichinopoly taluk, Trichinopoly district, at flood time?

A.—No proposal to prevent the submersion of lands to Chintamani, Trichinopoly taluk, Trichinopoly district, has been or is under the consideration of the Government.

One of the proposals made for the reclamation of the sanded lands in the Murungapettai area was to use the low-lying lands near St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly, as a dumping ground for the sand which was expected to be available if the Murungapettai area was cleared of it. The proposal contemplated the acquisition of lands in Chintamani by Government, raising their level and making them available for building purposes. It has since been reported, however, that if the Murungapettai High Level Channel scheme which is now under separate consideration is sanctioned, there would not be enough sand for raising the low-lying lands in the Trichinopoly town. The Government are therefore awaiting a decision on the Murungapettai High Level Channel scheme.

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—"May I know whether there was not a project to divert the surplus water to certain portions near Mulligudi?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—"I must ask for notice of the question."

Land Revenue

Levy of ground-rent in Trichinopoly municipality.

* 1046 Q.—Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that in August 1925, vacant sites on the Butterworth Road, Teppakulam, Trichinopoly, were sold in auction for the erection of houses, by the municipality, on the authority of the Government;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that in 1925, 1926, 1927, there was a levy of about 3 annas per plot as land tax, but no collection of ground-rent either by the Revenue authorities or by the municipality;

(*c*) whether in 1928 a ground-rent of Rs. 23 per site was collected under threat of coercive proceedings;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that the sales of the vacant house-sites in question took place subsequent to G.O. No. 1016, Revenue, dated 29th June 1923;

(*e*) whether the lands on which a ground-rent has been levied have been converted into buildings for dwelling purposes and there are no longer vacant lands assessable on that basis;

(*f*) whether, at the time of the said levy, G.O. No. 436, dated 8th March 1927, prescribing a rate of Rs. 6-4-0 per acre was in force;

(*g*) whether it is a fact that the Municipal Council, Trichinopoly, by its resolution, dated 11th December 1928, reduced the ground-rent to Rupees 6-4-0 per acre; and

(*h*) why the Revenue authorities at Trichinopoly insist on the collection from the owners of the newly-built houses on Butterworth Road of a ground-rent of Rs. 425 per acre?

A.—(*a*) & (*d*) Yes.

(*b*) & (*c*) No collection was made in 1925, 1926 and 1927 at the rate of about 3 annas per plot. The ground-rent due for faslis 1925-26 to 1927-28 was collected in 1928 at the rate of Rs. 425 per acre per year; no collection was made at Rs. 23 per site at any time. In cases of default of payment the village officers applied for the issue of demand notices and demands were issued but the amounts were all collected before the actual service of process.

(*e*) Out of 49 plots sold eight sites have not yet been built upon.

(*f*) The Government Order has been in force since the date of its issue, viz., 8th March 1927.

(*g*) The following is an extract from the resolution referred to:—

"The Council resolves that the ground-rent on the house-sites in the Butterworth Road extension and Jasmine garden extension be reduced to Rs. 6-4-0 per acre subject to the approval of the Government."

(*h*) The reason is that one of the conditions embodied in the notice of sale published by the Chairman, Municipal Council, on 25th July 1925 was that the sites would be sold subject to the payment of ground-rent at the rate of Rs. 425 an acre.

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR:—"May I know why in the face of the municipal council resolution, Government would still persist in collecting the ground-rent of Rs. 425 an acre? May I ask whether they will hereafter desist from collecting this heavy ground-rent?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"The Government will continue to collect this rent as the land was sold subject to the condition that this rent should be paid."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I know the reasons which influenced the Government to fix this extraordinary rate?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"It was fixed over four years ago. I must ask for notice of the question."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I know the basis on which this lease amount was fixed, whether it was in relation to the area or the nature of the soil or what?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"Several matters may have been taken into consideration: I have no information as to what particular matters were considered in this connection."